



**CITY OF WINDSOR**

**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

**MINUTES**

**FOR THE HEARING OF**

**May 29, 2025**

A virtual hearing by the Committee of Adjustment for the City of Windsor was held on May 29, 2025, by Video Conference. The Hearing was called to order at 3:30 PM.

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Present:**

***Committee Members***

Mike Sleiman, Chair  
Dante Gatti, Vice-Chair  
Frank Cerasa, Member

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer  
Riley Dufour, Committee Clerk

**Regrets:**

Joe Balsamo, Vice-Chair  
Mohammed Baki, Member

Also in attendance, Administrative staff representing the interests of the City of Windsor were:

***Planning & Building Services Department***

Greg Atkinson, Deputy City Planner  
Zaid Zwayyed, Planner  
Brian Nagata, Planner  
Stefan Pavlica, Zoning Co-ordinator  
Conner O'Rourke, Zoning Co-ordinator  
Diana Radulescu, Planner

***Engineering & Geomatics Department***

Andrew Boroski, Technologist I

***Transportation Planning Department***

Elara Mehlou, Transportation Engineer

\* \* \* \* \*

**DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**  
**and the general nature thereof**

There being no disclosure of pecuniary interest at this time, the following applications were considered in the order as contained herein.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s): SAHER PETROS**

**Subject Lands: PLAN 1126 LOTS 1205 TO 1206;PT 1207 RP 12R16200 PART 2; and known as Municipal Number 3237 TURNER RD**

**Zoning: Residential RD1.1**

**RELIEF: Creating a new lot, seeking relief for the reduced minimum lot width and reduced minimum lot area for both the retained and severed lots.**

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by - D. Gatti  
Seconded By – F. Cerasa

That files A-038/25 and B-032/25; subject lands **PLAN 1126 LOTS 1205 TO 1206;PT 1207 RP 12R16200 PART 2; and known as Municipal Number 3237 TURNER RD** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Pillon-Abbs confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration with the conditions stated.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: D. Gatti

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s): SAHER PETROS**

**Subject Lands: PLAN 1126 LOTS 1205 TO 1206;PT 1207 RP 12R16200 PART 2; and known as Municipal Number 3237 TURNER RD**

**Zoning: Residential RD1.1**

**REQUEST: Severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.**

**RELIEF:**

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by - D. Gatti

Seconded By – F. Cerasa

That files A-038/25 and B-032/25; subject lands **PLAN 1126 LOTS 1205 TO 1206;PT 1207 RP 12R16200 PART 2; and known as Municipal Number 3237 TURNER RD** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Pillon-Abbs confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration with the conditions stated.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: D. Gatti

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** 2559793 ONTARIO INC

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 908 PT LOTS 302 & 303 and known as Municipal Number 2194 HOWARD AVE

**Zoning:** Residential RD2.2

**RELIEF:** Construction of an additional dwelling unit with maximum gross floor area for any accessory building,

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Magid Basilius, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Basilius confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: D. Gatti

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** BIAGIO PIGNANELLI, MARIE ROSE PIGNANELLI

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 260 LOT 4 and known as Municipal Number 137-143  
CAMERON AVE

**Zoning:** Residential RD2.1

**RELIEF:** Enlargement of a legal non-conforming use building with increased maximum lot coverage, main building height, and gross floor area for the main building.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Biagio and Rose Marie Pignanelli, Owners

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. and Mrs. Pignanelli confirm they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if the non-legal conforming use is permitted. Ms. Radulescu outlines the non-conforming use is in existence and there are no changes, and it will not intensify the use with no changes. The Chair outlines that under the zoning by-law, a zoning and bylaw shall not prevent any repairs/restorations, which he agrees with that of any building that was being lawfully used as a for legal non-conforming use. The use is not automatically lost, because you don't lose the use due to fire damage. The Chair further explains the building is the same use and that use must continue. Mrs. Radulescu outlines that the building footprint itself will remain and the building itself has had two significant fires and currently there is on file an order to comply. The intent to build within the existing foundation within the same building footprint is legally protected. Ms. Radulescu outlines the proposed is to add an addition on the back to increase the square footage of the four units, and her understanding is the intention is to properly adhere to building code and to create more habitable living situation for the units themselves. Ms. Radulescu further explains the enlargement of legal, non-conforming use building use owners have in Ontario, but as well the scale of the enlargement deemed appropriate by the planning department and there are minor variances to make sure that things are clearer. Mr. Cerasa confirms the height and if it is only on the addition. Mr. Cerasa outlines this is the main building and the slope of the roof and if it is existing. Mr. Pignanelli outlines that the building is damaged significantly. Mr. Gatti asks about the bedrooms existing and proposed. The applicant outlines there are 2 currently and 2 are proposed.

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** TRENT SOVRAN

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1140 LOT 116 LOT 117 and known as Municipal Number 2429 ALEXIS RD

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.2

**RELIEF:** Create a new lot, seeking relief for reduced minimum lot area for the proposed retained lot and reduced minimum lot width and minimum lot area for the proposed severed lot.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Trent Sovran, Owner

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by - D. Gatti  
Seconded By – F. Cerasa

That files A-040/25 and B-033/25; subject lands **PLAN 1140 LOT 116 LOT 117 and known as Municipal Number 2429 ALEXIS RD** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr., Sovran confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti  
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** TRENT SOVRAN

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1140 LOT 116 LOT 117 and known as Municipal Number 2429 ALEXIS RD

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.2

**REQUEST:** Severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Trent Sovran, Owner

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by - D. Gatti  
Seconded By – F. Cerasa

That files A-040/25 and B-033/25; subject lands **PLAN 1140 LOT 116 LOT 117 and known as Municipal Number 2429 ALEXIS RD** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr., Sovran confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti  
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.



**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** KAREN ROSEMARIE MCGOWAN, WAYNE MCGOWAN, CARLENE SOPHIA MITCHELL

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 57 LOT 22 S PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 361 CAMPBELL AVE

**Zoning:** Residential RD2.2

**RELIEF:** Create a new lot, requesting relief for reduced minimum side yard width for both the retained and severed lots.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Amanda Fernandez, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

That files A-041/25 and B-034/25; subject lands **PLAN 57 LOT 22 S PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 361 CAMPBELL AVE** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Fernandez confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. The Chair asks if this is a merger on title with the two properties and currently are they both owned by the same owner. Ms. Parent outlines she is unaware of them being merged on title. and they are the same owners.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED as applied for.**

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** KAREN ROSEMARIE MCGOWAN, WAYNE MCGOWAN, CARLENE SOPHIA MITCHELL

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 57 LOT 22 S PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 361 CAMPBELL AVE

**Zoning:** Residential RD2.2

**REQUEST:** Severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Amanda Fernandez, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

That files A-041/25 and B-034/25; subject lands **PLAN 57 LOT 22 S PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 361 CAMPBELL AVE** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Fernandez confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. The Chair asks if this is a merger on title with the two properties and currently are they both owned by the same owner. Ms. Parent outlines she is unaware of them being merged on title. and they are the same owners.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** AHMAD EL-RIFAI

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 449; LOT 14 and known as Municipal Number 489 MCEWAN AVE

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.3

**RELIEF:** Proposed detached workshop at the rear of the property seeking relief for the increased maximum lot coverage and increased maximum lot coverage for all accessory buildings.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Shane Xue, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

The Secretary-Treasurer states that there have been objections received with respect to the proposed and have been shared with administration, the Applicant and the Committee of Adjustment for review prior to these proceedings.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Xue confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Cerasa asks the applicant to define workshop. Mr. Xue outlines it is for carpentry for cabinets, and it's not intended for any heavy industrial, mechanical or commercial use by his client. He outlines it is for hobbies and personal use. The Chair confirms there won't be clients attending the location, and there won't be any vehicle repair shop or commercial use. Mr. Xue confirms. The Chair confirms that the applicant is aware that operating any business under the current bylaw at this residence is prohibited. Mr. Xue confirms. Mr. Gatti asks for confirmation of the hobby. Mr. Xue outlines his client may do renovations for his own purpose, and he renovates houses, which includes wood repairs and fixes items, however it is hard to give an exact example.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** GARY DANIELS WILLIAMS, LISA WILLIAMS, LEON WILLIAMS

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 620; LOT 23 and known as Municipal Number 2662  
RICHMOND ST

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.3

**RELIEF:** Restoration of a fire-damaged duplex with maximum lot coverage  
and minimum side yard width

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Leon Williams, Owner  
Joseph Vidican, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Williams/Vidican confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Cerasa asks if what is being proposed is 0.96-meter side yard/if it is currently existing? Mr. Vidican response Yes, it has been existing for over 80, - 100 years on that building. They are not changing that set back at all. There is about 18 inches by 5 feet in the back corner that wasn't squared off, and that's the variance that's on that .96, but it's in line with the existing north side of the building There is no change to that to the South side, that is requesting reduction. The set back on the South side be required because the stairs that used to be on the outside were in front of the building and will be removed to acquire the frontline set back. The same is for the face of the building. It is being reduced because of the reject of the removal of those stairs and to be incorporated into the building. There is about 3.5 feet off the front. The Chair outlines he does not support reduction to side yard set back due to access and safety concerns. In this case the property is a corner lot with excellent emergency access. The proposed reduction is the way I look at it is a minimal and the enclosed stair replace. An open stair that previously existed in the same location, given these factors and the safeguard of the building code he is comfortable supporting this request.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: D. Gatti

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** CASTLEPLEX HOLDINGS LIMITED

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1354 LOTS 91 & 92;PT CLOSED ALLEY and known as  
Municipal Number 543 VANIER ST

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.3

**RELIEF:** Proposed detached additional dwelling unit at the rear of the  
property, requesting relief for the increased maximum lot coverage  
for all accessory buildings.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Razik Sarsam, Owner

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Sarsam confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Gatti asks if the increase is 13% and what would be considered too much. Ms. Parent outlines that she has maxed it at 12% in the recommendation, The Chair asks the applicant why the ADU was not designed to comply with the 10% requirement, or at least? Mr. Sarsam outlines by looking at the footprint at 10% he would have to put a 2 Storey ADU which would be a humongous, building in the lot and didn't think it was required, as he just wanted to provide something functional.

At 12.9%, which would have been about 700 square feet, would have had a smaller lower in height functional space, which would have sufficed.

Mr. Cerasa asks if this is for residential and personal use. Mr. Sarsam outlines it would be a rental. The intention is the retained lot will remain and the ADU will be in the back. Mr. Cerasa outlines his view, and feels it is in violation and if had to do it again, it should be smaller, or a lower roof and they are equally efficient. Mr. Sarsam outlines if that is the case, he would need to build a portion of the proposed underground, and he is not looking to take that route.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **BE GRANTED** with the amended 12.0% requested by administration.

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

**APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**

**Owner(s):** 1998308 ONTARIO INC

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 708; LOTS 629 TO 638 and known as Municipal Number 1561 ARMANDA ST

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.1

**REQUEST:** Consent for 2 new lots.

**RELIEF:** Creating 2 new lots, requesting relief from the minimum lot width and area for the newly created lots.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

That files A-045/25 and B-035/25 and B-036/25; subject lands **PLAN 708; LOTS 629 TO 638 and known as Municipal Number 1561 ARMANDA ST** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Pillon-Abbs confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration all of them except for one within the two consent applications. She outlines she is not in support of the condition required for the archaeology assessment and is requesting that it be removed as a condition. Her rationale is this is a very unique situation, currently her client has 10 legal lots of record on this particular property, it is just that they are undersized. She further, her applicant is only taking the middle lots, splitting them into two and adding it to the abutting lots. She further explains the lot to the left. A. So at the end of the day, it is just consolidating to bring it closer into compliance with that zoning bylaw and with the minor variance we have been able to stay as close to the 20% as possible. So, we already have lots, and we understand that the guideline set out by the Heritage Master Plan is to trigger a consent application on a new lot. But technically, even though we have applied for a consent only it was because to get to a deed we are not really creating any new lots.

Mrs. Pillon-Abbs explains right now – here client could actually go in and do a building permit application today without having to do any archaeology and the concern about archaeology is that the ministry is just so behind and this could potentially take up to 10 months for a ministry clearance and we feel that this is over and above what you would normally allow for a traditional lot line adjustment.

Mr. Atkinson gives an overview that archaeological condition relates back to the provincial planning statement, so it requires that municipality shall conserve archaeological resources and in order to meet that provincial requirement, the city has an archaeological master plan which set out areas of the city where it's likely that you're going to find art like archaeological artifacts so we've got mapping by property and where development applications fall within that mapping, than a archaeological study is required.

Mr. Atkinson outlines if they are going to meet the 15-meter frontage requirement and lot area, they could obtain a building permit, but that is not the case for this proposal. They are requiring minor variances for these lots. And there would be a development application required. Mr. Cerasa outlines that the province has set the guidelines, and the COA should not be going around it as it could set a precedent. Mr. Gatti outlines that these lots are already small, and he feels that they are not within the characteristics of the neighbourhood and asks for administrations rationale.

Mr. Zwayeed, - addresses the committee- when this proposal was not made by administration, it was made by the applicant, we requested a justification report which is attached to this \_\_\_\_\_

application to better address some of the issues, I could refer that question to the plan retained by the applicant to justify the characteristics from our end. The percentage is at 20.5% which is not significantly larger than 20%.

The number listed here is 11.9 meters, but that number is a result of averaging the rear width on the front width. It is twelve meters, which is around the 20% to and when we saw that, we deemed it just as a minor variance as per the report that presented.

There are lots that vary in size in that area and we did not see any major impact of these lots on the surrounding context.

Mr. Gatti feels if there is an archaeological report requested than so be it, and it should be submitted. He feels these lots with their size will not fit the characteristics of the neighbourhood and is not in full support.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted.

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the application **DENIED**.

**CARRIED.**

The Chair advised the applicant that denial of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

